8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

of a few old people of Totolapan (San Miguel). According to the "Relación de Citlaltomáua," the area in which Cuitlatec was spoken extended in the southeast as far as vanished Chiantepec,[*] and fragments have been recorded by Weitlaner in coastal Atoyac.

Provincial borders in 1519.—The borders of Çihuatlan are as unclear as its linguistic features. Zacatula must have represented approximately the westerly outpost. Somewhere in the pathless mountains all along the north of Çihuatlan was the border between this province and the Tarascans and Cuitlatec. (The Cuitlatec seem to have been an entity distinct from both their powerful neighbors, Mexican and Tarascan.) A slender link through Otlatlan (modern Otatlán), in the fellow-tributary province of Tepequacuilco, bound Çihuatlan to the Empire, and to the east lay the never-subdued Yopes.[**]

TRIBUTE

In the records of tribute presented for this and the following thirty-seven provinces, the frequency of payment is indicated as follows: one asterisk, annual; two asterisks, semiannual. The few quarterly payments ("de ochenta en ochenta días") are noted.

Tribute of the whole province.—According to the *Matricula* page and its copy in the *Mendocino*, the following items of tribute were exacted from the province of Çihuatlan:

CLOTHING**

1,616 bundles[***] of large orange mantles
2,400 bundles of large mantles of "twisted" cloth

FOOD**

80 loads of cacao bermejo

OTHER GOODS**

400 bundles of cotton
800 red seashells, like scallops

[*] See the preceding note. On Cuitlatec see Hendrichs, "Un estudio preliminar sobre la lengua cuitlateca de San Miguel Totolapan, Guerrero," *El México Antiguo* (1939), 4: 329–362; Weitlaner, "Beitrag zur Sprache der Ocuilteca," *ibid.*, pp. 297–328, notes; and McQuown, "La fonémica del cuitlateco," *ibid.* (1941), 5: 239–254.

[**] See section on Tepequacuilco, below.

[***] The *Mendocino* résumé, in Spanish, has been followed throughout this study as a convenient guide on tribute. There are slight inaccuracies in the version it gives of numbers, however; the figures representing single units are consistently overlooked. Here I have corrected the figure from the erroneous "1,600."